

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 11 to 13, 15, 16 and 18 to 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Barrois, U.S. Patent No. 5,282,419 in view of GB 2314292 to Gandelheidt. Claims 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrois in view of Gandelheidt and further in view of Wagner, U.S. Patent No. 3,738,269. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrois in view of Gandelheidt and further in view of Wingo, U.S. Patent No. 5,036,761.

Claim 11 is amended herein to more particularly and distinctly claim the invention by clarifying that there is at least one ink reservoir which is connected to at least one ink exit in each zone.

The Final Office Action refers to GB 2 314 292 as Edogaa et al. Applicant respectfully submits the inventor of GB 2 314 292 as listed on the front page of the publication is Edgar Gandelheidt and accordingly refers to GB 2 314 292 as Gandelheidt.

Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

Claims 11 to 13, 15, 16 and 18 to 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Barrois, U.S. Patent No. 5,282,419 in view of GB 2314292 to Gandelheidt.

Barrois discloses an ink roller 1 having a hollow axle 11 with an interior ink reservoir 10. The hollow axle 11 has a plurality of bores 24 arranged in axially spaced groups or rings. A first inner sleeve 26 rotatably supported about hollow axle 11 has radially extending bores 29. A second intermediate sleeve 33 rotatably supported about inner sleeve 26 has a plurality of bores 41. An outer porous sleeve or shell 44 is rotatably supported about intermediate sleeve 33.

Gandelheidt discloses a printing cylinder 1 having a central cylindrical chamber 8. Microactuators 7 are provided with actuating devices 9 controlled by an ECU. Print images are fed into a microcomputer 11, which activates the microactuators 7.

Claim 11 recites “[a]n inking roller for an inking unit of an offset printing press comprising:

- a plurality of zones arranged in a direction of an axis of rotation;
- at least one ink reservoir in an interior of the inking roller connected to at least one ink exit in a circumferential surface of the inking roller in each of the plurality of zones; and

at least one pumping element in each of the plurality of zones in the interior of the inking unit for conveying ink from the ink reservoir to the circumferential surface of the inking roller; the inking roller being an offset printing press inking roller.”

The Examiner admits at page 2 of the November 3, 2008 Office Action that Barrois does not show or teach “at least one pumping element in each of the plurality of zones in the interior of the inking unit for conveying ink from the ink reservoir to the circumferential surface of the inking roller; the inking roller being an offset printing press inking roller” as recited in claim 11. Gandelheidt likewise does not disclose these limitations.

Instead, Gandelheidt discloses a printing cylinder for creating images based on data which prints directly on a web, while the present invention relates to an inking roller for an inking unit of an offset printing press. Inking rollers apply ink in zones to permit a plate cylinder to be inked. Gandelheidt does not disclose an offset printing press inking roller in which the ink flow is sufficient to transfer an image from a plate cylinder to a blanket cylinder. Nor, it is respectfully submitted, is the printing cylinder of Gandelheidt capable of functioning as an offset printing press inking roller, as the cylinder of Gandelheidt creates ink dots, which in combination with a plate cylinder and blanket cylinder, would result in an incomplete dotted image on a paper web.

In fact, the micropumps/valves 7 of printing roll 1 in Gandelheidt do not distribute ink over the axial length of the roll. Thus, even if, each bore 24, 29, 41 in Barrois was arranged with a micropump/valve 7, the pumps would not pass enough ink for wetting the surface of sleeve 44 nor would they pass enough ink to transfer an image from a printing plate to a blanket and further to a web. The micropump/valves would only pass enough ink to print ink dots on the printing plate.

Thus, Barrois in view of Gandelheidt does not teach or disclose “at least one pumping element in each of the plurality of zones in the interior of the inking unit for conveying ink from the ink reservoir to the circumferential surface of the inking roller; the inking roller being an offset printing press inking roller” as recited in claim 11.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to one of skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Barrois and Gandelheidt since the printing cylinder in Gandelheidt is not readily adaptable to the ink roller in Barrois. The printing roller in Gandelheidt is for printing raster images directly on a material web and would not be useful as an ink roller in an offset printing press since it would yield incomplete

images. This is another reason why the combination of Barrois and Gandelheidt does not render claim 11 obvious.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 11 to 13, 15, 16 and 18 to 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrois in view of Gandelheidt and further in view of Wagner, U.S. Patent No. 3,738,269.

Wagner discloses a printing member or roller 20 including a porous material 24.

Claim 14 is a dependent claim which adds the requirement that “the ink exit includes a perforated plug.”

In addition to the arguments presented above with respect to claim 11, Applicant notes that the material in Wagner operates by capillary action that is not needed or necessary with any pump as claimed. The rejection appears to be based solely on hindsight reasoning, and it is not believed or understood how the material of Wagner would distribute ink more evenly as asserted. This is an additional reason why claim 14 is not obvious over the combination of Barrois, Gandelheidt and Wagner.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 14 for this reason as well is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrois in view of Gandelheidt and further in view of Wingo, U.S. Patent No. 5,036,761.

Wingo discloses a water feed roller 11, preferably formed of stainless steel, to impart water to plurality of water form rollers comprising an upper water form roller 12 and a lower water form roller 12.

Claim 17 is a dependent claim which adds the requirement that “the at least one ink exit includes a number of ink exits present in one zone, the ink exits being located in a circumferential direction either in one angular section of a circumference in an accumulative way or distributed in a substantially even manner.”

In addition to the arguments presented above with respect to claim 11, Applicant respectfully submits that Wingo discloses a roller for feeding water, and not an inking roller as asserted. Wingo does not show or disclose “a number of ink exits” as claimed. Also, this is an additional reason why claim 17 is not obvious over the combination of Barrois, Gandelheidt and Wingo.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 17 for this reason as well is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests such action.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

Dated: February 3, 2009

By: _____



John S. Economou
Reg. No. 38,439

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue - 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940